LABOR-HHS-EDUCATION/Cut to Stay On-Budget, Education Exception

SUBJECT: Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 2000 . . . S. 1650. Nickles motion to table the Kennedy amendment No. 2268.

ACTION: MOTION TO TABLE AGREED TO, 50-49

SYNOPSIS: As reported, S. 1650, the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 2000, will provide \$324.2 billion in new budget authority, which is \$22.531 billion more than provided in fiscal year (FY) 1999 and is \$911.0 million less than requested. This amount includes advance discretionary and mandatory appropriations and \$9.902 billion in spending from trust funds. Budget authority for fiscal year 2000 discretionary spending will total \$84.018 billion.

The Kennedy amendment would exclude funding for education from an across-the-board spending cut that might be made to protect part of the Social Security surplus from being spent.

Debate was limited by unanimous consent. After debate, Senator Nickles moved to table the Kennedy amendment. Generally, those favoring the motion to table opposed the amendment; those opposing the motion to table favored the amendment.

Those favoring the motion to table contended:

Our colleagues, again, are throwing around wild estimates of the size of across-the-board cuts that may be necessary to avoid spending any of the Social Security surplus this year. Right now it looks as though we may be off by about \$5 billion out of a \$1.8 trillion budget. It is still too early to say whether or not it is, because budgets are based on estimates of receipts that will be received as well as definite spending proposals. A \$5 billion cut out of the \$500 billion discretionary part of the budget is just a 1-percent cut. That cut, if needed and if taken across-the-board, will not decimate Federal funding for any program, including any education program. In fact, we note that since Republicans have taken over control of Congress discretionary funding on this particular

(See other side)

YEAS (50)			NAYS (49)			NOT VOTING (1)	
Republicans Democrats (50 or 93%) (0 or 0%)		Republicans (4 or 7%)	Democrats (45 or 100%)		Republicans	Democrats	
					(1)	(0)	
Abraham Allard Ashcroft Bennett Bond Brownback Bunning Burns Campbell Chafee Cochran Coverdell Craig Crapo Domenici Enzi Fitzgerald Frist Gorton Gramm Grams Grassley Gregg Hagel Hatch	Helms Hutchinson Hutchison Inhofe Jeffords Kyl Lott Lugar Mack McConnell Murkowski Nickles Roberts Roth Santorum Sessions Shelby Smith, Bob (I) Smith, Gordon Stevens Thomas Thompson Thurmond Voinovich Warner		Collins DeWine Snowe Specter	Akaka Baucus Bayh Biden Bingaman Boxer Breaux Bryan Byrd Cleland Conrad Daschle Dodd Dorgan Durbin Edwards Feingold Feinstein Graham Harkin Hollings Inouye Johnson	Kennedy Kerrey Kerry Kohl Landrieu Lautenberg Leahy Levin Lieberman Lincoln Mikulski Moynihan Murray Reed Reid Robb Rockefeller Sarbanes Schumer Torricelli Wellstone Wyden	EXPLANAT 1—Official F 2—Necessar 3—Illness 4—Other SYMBOLS: AY—Annou AN—Annou PY—Paired PN—Paired	nced Yea nced Nay Yea

VOTE NO. 316 OCTOBER 6, 1999

appropriations bill has grown dramatically. In 1996, it was \$63.4 billion; in 1997, it was \$71 billion; in 1998, it was \$80.4 billion; on this bill it is \$84.4 billion. Republicans have been much more generous to the programs in this bill, including education programs, than Democrats were when they were in charge, and at the same time they have been able to bring the budget into balance. We have provided a large increase for education funding again this year, \$2.3 billion, which is more than the President requested. Even if a 1-percent reduction became necessary, education spending would remain \$2 billion higher than last year, which would still be more than the Clinton/Gore Administration requested. An across-the-board cut would not treat education unfairly or harm Federal education efforts. The Kennedy amendment should be rejected.

Those opposing the motion to table contended:

Education funding is a huge priority. Republicans have indicated that should their spending estimates prove wrong and an onbudget deficit results, their preference will be to cut spending across the board rather than taking the money out of the Social Security surplus. We do not object to protecting Social Security, but we certainly object to an across-the-board cut. By OMB estimates, our Republican colleagues may have already proposed so much new spending that a 10-percent, across-the-board cut will be necessary in order not to raid Social Security. We would certainly rather get the needed funds by eliminating tax expenditures instead of cutting spending, but, if spending is going to be cut, we think education is important enough to get an exemption. A 10-percent cut would take \$800 million out of education funding for disadvantaged children, \$40 million out of afterschool programs, and \$600 million out of special education. We favor increasing funding for those purposes, not cutting it. We trust our colleagues agree and will join us in opposing the motion to table this amendment.